Natural Resources Conservation Service

Application Ranking Summary

Watershed Improvemennt - Wild fire Rehabiltation

Program:	Ranking Date:	Application Number:
Ranking Tool: Watershed Improvement - Wild fire Rehabilitation		Applicant:
Final Ranking Score:		Address:
Planner:		Telephone:
Farm Location:		

National Priorities Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
1. Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in considerable reductions of non-point source pollution, such as nutrients, sediment, pesticides, excess salinity in impaired watersheds, groundwater contamination or point source contamination from confined animal feeding operations?	
2. Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable amount of ground or surface water conservation?	
3. Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable reduction of emissions, such as particulate matter, nitrogen oxides (NOx), volatile organic compounds, and ozone precursors and depleters that contribute to air quality impairment violations of National Ambient Air Quality Standards?	
4. Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable reduction in soil erosion and sedimentation from unacceptable levels on agricultural land?	
5. Will the treatment you intend to implement using EQIP result in a considerable increase in the promotion of at-risk species habitat conservation?	

State Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	
Total private grazingland acres versus Burned grazingland acres.	
1. BURNED ACRES: Is the percentage of burned private grazing land acres 0.1-24%?	Yes O or No O
2. BURNED ACRES: Is the percentage of burned private grazing land acres 25-50%	Yes O or No O
3. BURNED ACRES: Is the percentage of burned private grazing land acres 51% - 74%	Yes O or No O
4. BURNED ACRES: Is the percentage of burned private grazing land acres 75%- 100%	Yes O or No O
Management	
5. Is the applicant implementing a postburn Prescribed grazing system for the length of the contract?	Yes O or No O
6. Is the average distance greater than 1 meter between perennial herbaceous plants?	Yes O or No O
7. If range seeding is to be implemented is the applicant including a plant species in the seed mix as recommended in writing from a DWR or NRCS wildlife biologist?	Yes O or No O
8. Was the pre-burn plant community dominated by invasive annuals such as cheatgrass, medusa head, Russian thistle, or the mustard family etc?	Yes O or No O
Erodibilty	
9. Is the wind erodabilty index (I) 48 or less	Yes O or No O
10. Is the wind erodabilty index (I) between 56 and 85	Yes O or No O
11. Is the wind erodabilty index (I) 86 or greater	Yes O or No O
12. is the water erodabilty factor (Kw) less than or equal to .02	Yes O or No O
13. is the water erodabilty factor (Kw) greater than .02 or less than .4	Yes O or No O
14. is the water erodabilty factor (Kw) equal to or greater than .4	Yes O or No O

Local Issues Addressed

Issue Questions	Responses
-----------------	-----------

Land Use:

Resource Concerns	Practices
Ranking Score	
Efficiency:	
Local Issues:	
State Issues:	
National Issues:	
Final Ranking Score:	

This ranking report is for your information. It does not in any way guarantee funding. When funding becomes available, you will be notified if your application is selected for funding. Some changes to the application may be required before a final contract is awarded.

Notes:

	Application Signature Not Required for Contract Development unless required by State policy:
Signature Date:	Signature Date: